

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of January 4, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 32-35, 47, 49-51, 56 and 59-60 have been amended. Claims 62-67 have been added. Claims 32-35, 47, 49-51, 56, 58-60 and 62-67 are pending upon entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested in view of the following arguments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 32-35, 47, 49-51, 56 and 58-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tsimelzon, Jr. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0177148, “Tsimelzon”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 58 recites, *inter alia*, “the response template including instructions for converting the user requested data from a first language format to a second language format, wherein the second language format is selected based on one or more attributes of the terminal.” Nowhere does Tsimelzon teach or suggest such features. At most, Tsimelzon describes the creation of shortpages definable by a user. Abstract. Shortpages allows a user to select various portions or blocks of a web page that he or she wishes to view. *Id.* Blocks that are not selected by the user are not included in the shortpage. p. 3, ¶¶ [0046]-[0048]. Even so, the creation of a shortpage, as taught by Tsimelzon, does not constitute a template including instructions for converting of user requested data from a first language format to a second language format as recited in claim 58. Further, the mere removal of large graphic files and/or Java Script code from a shortpage if the client is a handheld device, as disclosed by Tsimelzon at p. 6, ¶ [0090], also does not constitute instructions for *converting data from a first language format to a second language format*. Accordingly, claim 58 is allowable for at least this reason.

Amended independent claim 59 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the page template includes instructions for converting requested data associated with the selection information from a first language format to a second language format, the second language format selected based on one or more attributes of the at least one terminal.” As discussed above, Tsimelzon is limited to the creation of shortpages and removal of large graphic files and/or code. Nowhere does Tsimelzon

teach or suggest a page template that includes instructions for converting requested data from a first language format to a second language format as recited in claim 59. Accordingly, claim 59 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 32-35, 47, 49, 50, 51, 56 and 60 depend on claim 59 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 59 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 60 recites, *inter alia*, “a selection of the page template is performed according to a size of a display of the terminal and a capability of the terminal to support signalling protocol.” Tsimelzon is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of selecting a page template according to a capability of the terminal to support signaling protocol. Significantly, the Office Action fails to address this feature of claim 60. At most, the Office Action alleges, at p. 3, that Tsimelzon “(takes into account which type of device the requested information is being sent to, 0090).” Even assuming, without conceding, the validity of such an assertion, merely taking into account device type does not constitute selecting a template according to *a capability of the terminal to support signaling protocol* as recited in claim 60. Claim 60 is thus allowable for this additional reason.

New Claims

Claims 62-67 have been added. The following discussion of the new claims with regard to Tsimelzon is provided to expedite prosecution.

New independent claims 62 and 65 both generally relate to, *inter alia*, identifying a template including instructions for converting data associated with the service selected by the terminal from a first language format to a second language format, wherein the second language format is selected based on the one or more attributes of the terminal. As discussed above with respect to claim 58, Tsimelzon lacks any teaching or suggestion of converting data from a first language format to a second language format, wherein the second language format is selected based on one or more attributes of a terminal. Accordingly, claims 62 and 65 are allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 63, 64, 66 and 67 are dependent on claims 62 and 65, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 4th day of April, 2007

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001